

**Excerpt from the
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING
Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)
250 South Fourth Street, Room 300
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385
(612) 673-3153 Phone
(612) 673-2526 Fax**

The following actions were taken by the Heritage Preservation Committee on March 18, 2014. The Heritage Preservation Committee's decisions on items are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period.

Commissioners present: Ms. Laura Faucher, Mr. Chris Hartnett, Ms. Susan Hunter Weir, Ms. Ginny Lackovic, Ms. Linda Mack, Mr. Robert Mack, Mr. Ian Stade, and Ms. Constance Vork

Committee Clerk: Fatima Porter 612.673.3153

ITEM SUMMARY

Description:

Item #2- 2320 Colfax Avenue South (BZH #28079 Ward 10) (John Smoley)

Michael Crow submitted a demolition of a historic resource application to demolish the residence at 2320 Colfax Avenue South.

Action:

Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the Heritage Preservation Commission **denied** the demolition of the property located at 2320 Colfax Avenue South, established interim protection, and directed the Planning Director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study.

Absent: P. Bengtson, A. Haecker

Aye: C. Hartnett, S. Hunter Weir, G. Lackovic, R. Mack, C. Vork

Nay: L. Faucher, L. Mack, I. Stade

Motion passed

TRANSCRIPTION

Staff Smoley presented the report.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: Dr. Smoley, I'm frankly a little puzzled by what we're being asked to consider here. It seems that a year ago we looked at this property; we knew about the fire, we knew about the siding, we knew all of those things and still thought of this property as a historic resource and that was appealed to both Zoning and Planning and City Council and they upheld that. So it seems to me like we're being asked now to say it's not historic enough. Am I understanding this correctly? I guess my question is if I voted and said

this was historic last year, what has happened to that building in the meantime that makes it less historic this year?

Staff Smoley: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hunter Weir, members of the commission, I can let the applicant speak to any changes that have been made to the property since last year. Recognize that the commission was determining whether the property met the definition of a historic resource or not, which per the heritage preservation regulations is to find it meeting one of the seven significance criteria listed in the heritage preservation regulations. The commission found that this did exemplify the work of master builder Theron Potter Healy. And so staff then turned to the applicant and noted that if they wanted to demolish the building they would have to bring to you a demolition of a historic resource application which allows consideration of more than simply the significance of the property. It also requires the commission to consider but not be limited to the integrity of the property, reasonable alternatives to demolition, the economic value or usefulness of the structure; you consider life safety requirements or hazards that might warrant the demolition of the property as well. So this allows the commission and staff to focus on more than the significance of the property but extenuating circumstances that might not make this building the best candidate for legally mandated preservation. And of course you wouldn't be, with this determination be saying that preservation was legally mandated. One of the possible outcomes of this, if you didn't approve the demolition, would be to institute interim protection, and direct the Planning Director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study.

Pete Keely: Collage Architects. I've been working with the development team as well as the owner. I'm just going to give a brief intro of whose here and what we're going to talk about. We have Mike Crow who is the owner of the building, who purchased the building around 1991, right after the major fire and the reconstruction. So a lot of what has happened in that meantime was after the fire was items that needed to be corrected to keep the stability of the home. So a lot of the historic features that were lost were not of his doing. Second we have Tony Kriha of the Lander Group. The Lander Group actually looks at projects a lot of different ways not necessarily a tear down first, he's going to talk about their philosophy and how they derived the numbers and how they constitute what feasibility means in terms of moving forward and looking at a project that would fit within the neighborhood. We have Tom Dunn from Terra Commercial. Who listed the property, it's been on the market for seven years. And has the current listing that no one has come forward and he'll talk a bit about that. We have Amy Lucas from Landscape Research who will talk about some additional items of historic research. One of the outcomes of this, as staff mentioned is a designation study, that designation study moving forward, looking at some of those items and some of the obstacles to designation of this property. So we are here to ask for approval of the demolition permit. And we are here to say that the integrity of the home, the usefulness of the home has gone away. And there are better examples; I think the rest of the team will kind of describe that in further detail. We have a lot of information, we have photographs, if something comes up with this, we respect your time, and we don't want to go through all of that but just letting you know that that's here in case those questions arise. With that, Mike Crow, who is the current owner of 2320 Colfax.

Mike Crow (2744 Aldrich Ave S): I own 2320 Colfax Avenue South. To kind of answer your question that you asked. The last time we were here before the HPC, and part of the reason you said you made your decision was to give people time to do something else with the building other than demo it. In the year since that, we've been on local, national television, every newspaper in the city and we've had the place available for showings to anybody that was interested and I've shown it dozens of times, without anybody coming forward and making an offer to purchase or do anything else with the building. The only thing I've heard the whole time was the same thing I heard before, that there's not enough left of the building left to do anything with. There's less there than what they thought by what they heard. None of the people, including, Anders Christensen and Nicole Curtis, that were here before, that said they were going to do something have come forward with anything either since they got the decision that they wanted. That's the answer on that. I purchased 2320 Colfax in 1991 after it had been in a major fire. It destroyed the second and third floor and caused significant water damage to the first floor. Because of the type of rental that it was, it had to be remodeled into apartment standards and codes. It had been a rooming house for decades before that and had lost some of its old world charm. And would not have been cost effective or even possible to restore what was there before the fire, much less what was there left after the fire. There has been some misinformation of the building being abused and drained of its value which is not true. Since I've owned the property including the fire, I've put well over \$250,000 into improvements, siding, windows, roof, chimney, boiler, water main, not to include regular maintenance like carpeting the building four times in 22 years, painting and remodeling bathrooms. There's also been a claim that there's original siding under the vinyl which is not true. There is some but most of the siding is not original. If you look at the old pictures, you will see that the south side of the building has been completely changed. All the round bays and bows are gone, removed when the slate siding and additions were installed. I guess that's all I have to say.

Tony Kriha (2024 Queen Ave S): Michael Lander and the Lander Group have over 30 years of experience as an urban developer. We have achieved many industry design awards including Minneapolis and Saint Paul preservation awards. When assessing sites for acquisition we look first to reuse and our portfolio reflects that. A few examples would be the 1869 Andrews house in the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood that was done in 1999, the 1906 fire station 23 at 35th and Hennepin done in 1991. Ninth Street Lofts in downtown Saint Paul that we did in 2004. We feel existing buildings can often be reused and reworked and their history adds value and character. The most similar project to the Colfax site is the Andrews House which I referenced earlier, where we were invited by the neighborhood to renovate this incredible property. The cost to renovate exceeds value by \$400,000 dollars. That gap was supported by the neighborhood using NRP funds to fill the gap and we successfully completed an award winning project that met and exceeded the community's goals. The Colfax site from an economic feasibility perspective, we looked at the idea of renovating the home as a single-family home or multi-family residences. Renovation cost both inside and out, our estimates using reputable contractors as references were conservatively set at \$150 per square foot, and they do not include design, marketing, and finance cost, and they do not renovate to historic finish level. Comparable sales after renovation were valued at an estimate of \$240 per square foot for condominiums in the local area and single-family homes are unlikely to achieve \$200 per square foot of value. Adding the value of existing building and

including land, design cost, permitting, legal, landscape, financing, marketing and reasonable contingency cost without a profit, the gap for this project would be estimated at nearly half a million dollars. So in our assessment renovation of the existing building, we deem unfeasible, which is why we made the decision to pursue another course. Thank you.

Tom Dunn (8200 Humboldt Ave S): I am a commercial real estate broker with Terra Firma Commercial. I've been in commercial real estate for almost 30 years. I've, myself, remodeled eleven properties on my own. I'm here just to speak on behalf of the seller and have you consider the sellers positions. He's owned this thing since 1991, he's been paying real estate taxes on it all that time, they are about \$15,000 a year today. I want you to listen to the facts as they are being presented. Did you know that the Vikings didn't have horns on their helmets? They didn't have horns on their helmets. That was a rumor started by ancient Romans and that's a myth that's been perpetuated throughout time and that's essentially what is being done here. A myth of the historic nature of this building when there really is none. So I really want you and encourage you to listen to the facts. The building doesn't actually need to be remodeled; it works fine as a rooming house. But one of the things that we found in the marketing of it is that there is no market for rooming houses anymore. There used to be a lot of them around the Twin Cities, around Minneapolis. Even in this area but there aren't today. Nobody wants to run them, they're like video stores, they're just going out of business. So that's what we're faced with here, we're marketing it and we just can't find a buyer. There's no exit strategy for a buyer either, who's he going to sell it to when he buys it? So, it needs to be repositioned somehow. It also ignores the fact, this discussion, of a duplex next door. This is a unique situation because the land here is a little bit larger than what would typically be available in this setting with two houses next to each other. We have a little bit of extra square footage to put some more units and get more density to make it reasonable for an apartment building to go in here. The other thing is if you look at from a big picture it is a win, win, win for everybody. It's surrounded by commercial properties, Hennepin Avenue is less than a block of away, it's in a high density corridor, serves as a buffer for future development going to the east and into the neighborhood. There is just no reason to stand in the way of allowing this project to go forward, other than based on some logic that you're committed to a cause of some kind. But in this instance it really doesn't have any relevance. So I just want you to listen to the historic nature, to what the experts are saying about the historic significance of this property. There just isn't any. I appreciate your time, thank you.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: Did you market this property other than as a boarding house? Did you market it as a single-family home?

Tom Dunn: Yeah, well, we marketed as an apartment complex, that's probably the most likely buyer. That is one thing that I wanted to state too. We started marketing it, we got the listing agreement in May of 2012, brought it under contract in August 2012, marketed it typical channels marketing a property such as a multi-family property. And I talked to a lot of people, a lot of people already knew that it was available. Mike had been trying to market it for many many years before I came along. In fact, after I started marketing it, I called him because everybody I was talking to knew about it. So, to say that the word did not get out there in the market place is a falsehood.

Commissioner Stade: But it wasn't on the single family home market place.

Tom Dunn: No it was never marketed as a single family home. There was no reason to. That's one of the things about it, is there's an income stream that's established here and there's real estate taxes and expenses to pay. So you have to maintain the income stream, so when you go to look for a buyer, etc...I'm sorry.

Commissioner Vork: Can you tell me what websites you marketed this property on?

Tom Dunn: It was on my personal website Terra Firma Commercial. Generally we don't put apartment buildings out on MLS listings because the people that go over and bother tenants and things like that. One of the things that you'll find in the apartment market here in the Twin Cities is that 20 percent of the people own 80 percent of the properties. So it's pretty easy to market towards those folks. We're all marketing towards the same guys. So, we go and market directly to those owners in the market place.

Commissioner Vork: So can you confirm then, that you did not place this property on MNCAR (Minnesota Commercial Association of Realtors) the commercial listing service.

Tom Dunn: That is correct.

Amy Lucas (1466 Hythe Street): With Landscape Research. I don't know if any of you have been in the house but when it burned, the second and third floors burned completely. So they were rebuilt as small rooms upstairs, so there are sheetrock walls and metal doors to meet fire code standards. So there are fairly small rooms on the second and third floors like a rooming house, the kitchen is still on the first floor, but they do have a shared bathroom in between. And we do have more photos if people want to see what it looks like upstairs. I actually just did the historic evaluation and I know it was sent to folks this week and I'm here to answer questions about it. I don't need to go through the lengthy part of it. I think staff, Dr. Smoley, did a good job of that. Historic resource as the HPC (Heritage Preservation Committee) ordinance defines it is a property that appears to meet one of the criteria for designation and so at the last hearing with HPC the commissioners felt that it may be a Queen Anne, a traditional Queen Anne but also by Healy. So my research, I looked at all seven criteria, but I did really look at the designation criteria, and this is a fairly lengthy report, one that I would do for a true designation of a property. I mean this report does cover what I've done in the past even for National Register standards of property. I just really want to concentrate on three things. One, the original property owner Orth. We have the original deed here, and I did a title search with that. (End of tape 1 side A)...with the economic depression, then moved on to run an ice company from 1896 to 1908. He ran it as a dealer with a few other people, there were 11 to 15 companies dealing ice in those years that he was there. I did not find that his significance or his stay for not commissioning the property or staying that long lead the significance to him. I didn't find any extra significance associated with Edward Orth or Thomas Kenyon after him. Healy was a master builder and that's what I'd like to talk about more. We did actually this summer after the hearing; we went to, Mr. Christensen gave us a great list, we went to all 140 properties that had been looked at, I

know, I had a great summer intern. She photographed them and even went and looked at all the building permits to see what was still there and what the integrity was. Which is how I came back with a few of them and the one that Dr. Smoley pointed out, 1716 Dupont as one that's fairly similar built a year later. So the house 2320 Colfax is 1893, the house he pointed out to you; the blue wood sided house is 1894. The style is called Free-Classic. I got a little bit into this in the report, the Queen Anne style is broken into four sub-sets. These four types are recognized by the National Park Service, and they're listed in the National Register nominations. Two kind of rare ones are the half-timber, the pattern masonry, those you don't see as much. Spindle Work you see quite a bit as a Queen Anne and Healy was a master of those. There are many in the Healy Block in great shape. The Free-Classic started to move towards that transitional Neoclassical, Revival, Colonial Revival style, with some bays, wider porches across the front, and sometimes more classical columns on the porches. And this one originally was built as more of a Free Classic style in 1893. The Healy Block Historic District nomination though, list Healy's house in 1891 as his transitional style moment where they really see him move from a Spindle Work perhaps to a more Free-Classic Queen Anne type style. This house at 2320 Colfax does not resemble its original style. We have a great photo, the Orth family; the daughter had a beautiful photo album that's at the Minneapolis collection. And she did photograph her family home on Marshall, no longer there but the Orth brewery home and the Orth brewery, no longer there, and then this house where she lived for a while with her family. They moved on to live in flats about the city. Orth had two more houses after this; he died on Vincent I think the report says, 4400 Vincent or something around there. But what I'd like to say more about this architecture is there were probably a third of Queen Anne houses in the city too. But Queen Anne in general that were Free-Classic types. When my great intern drove the city, the percentages were about right of the ones she photographed as well, for Spindle Work, Free-Classic. She did actually did have a few brick ones too. But the bottom line on this is; would Healy say that this exemplified his style or his architectural works? If you were going to look at an individual designation of one property, does this exemplify the Free-Classic Queen Anne design by Healy? I mean we pointed out a few today. This one today no longer has the integrity of its original design. The interior has been greatly muddled. There are very few interior designations in the city. The Grain Exchange trading floor, the State, the Orpheum, their rare typed actually look at, designations of material, in fact this building, delineates what is actually the interior and what is designated in City Hall as well. So when we look at the exterior, my thoughts were, just looking at integrity standards and how to judge integrity. Does it exemplify? No, I don't believe that it does, I don't think it retains the integrity and designation, especially for an individual property is really about what you're looking at and what you see. Not what it could become what it could be restored as or remodeled as. This is an individual basis. We've had lots of discussions about individual houses on Lake of the Isles and the number of alterations towards those and what that means for an individual designation. I think the grouping of Healy homes has really preserved some of those. There's a Healy home on the Healy Block that's actually determined noncontributing because when it was designated as a district, it did not have the integrity to be a Healy, a contributing property in the National Register district. So thinking about integrity is the bottom line on, I believe, a local designation and the intent of the historic district design guidelines and criteria. But I'm here to answer any questions about the report as well.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: How much research did you do on Thomas Kenyon?

Amy Lucas: I did a fair amount on Thomas Kenyon. There were a few things he was, he made his money actually as a pharmaceutical sales rep. He did on the side make this Kondons jelly. It was kind of a nose cream, kind of like a Halls mentha-lyptus thing that kids did. Most people describe that as; Kondons is listed as a quack type medicine. It was very common; he did wonderful job marketing. And that's actually where he gets his reputation as a wonderful marketing person, for his sales. They weren't high sales. He didn't leave the neighborhood until he died his wife left. The neighborhood really also went down when they were there. The apartment building behind it, Colonial Homes, or whatever it's called, it was built in 1910 so as Thomas Kenyon was there, he actually saw his neighborhood changing quite a bit before zoning codes even. But I did do a fair amount of research on all of the people that lived there. It got fairly tricky after Kenyon died. Then it was a lot of overturn and probably even rental before it was listed as a rental property. Kenyon didn't design the home; he didn't make great changes to it. I don't know when the carriage house was demolished. But it wasn't a property designed for him; this was a tenure place for him.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I guess my comment then is, I've done quite a bit of research on Mr. Kenyon as well and it was not a quack medicine. He didn't make his money selling snake oil. He was an entrepreneur and that product was around for fifty years. It was in 35,000 stores around the country. And I'm not criticizing you for that, I'm just saying that he was overlooked and people made a very big deal about how not historic Mr. Orth was. But I'm not sure that we didn't overlook something.

Amy Lucas: I looked at his medicine quite a bit. He purchased that company, he didn't actually start the Kondon Company and that jelly, and he purchased that part of the manufacturing business of it. But he still continued to work for a pharmaceutical sales rep at a different company as he was kind of working on that. That being said, sorry I can't answer more about...

Commissioner Stade: I actually have a question about when it was built; do you know how many houses he built during the panic of 1893 besides this one?

Amy Lucas: No but incredibly he built a lot in 1894.

Commissioner Stade: And this was built in 1893. As far as I understand it, it was his transition time because of the economic situation. He had to make simpler houses because of the way the economy changed.

Amy Lucas: I don't think that's why the Free-Classic Queen Anne style came about. I think that Colonial Revival style came about long before this actually. Most people would say 1880s you start to see a lot of Free-Classics. McAllister says that as well.

Commissioner Stade: Do you know how much his houses cost, between 1892 and 1893? Like the average cost, were they going up still with the economy?

Amy Lucas: My intern did look at that. This house lost, it went down in value incredibly when Orth sold it to Kenyon sadly. This one was \$7,000; I can't remember what the Dupont house was. I think they were a lot of seven to twelves.

Pete Keeley: Just real quick, again we'd be happy to answer more questions or show more photos but in the end, obviously, anything can be done. The home can be reconstructed, it can be reconstructed exactly like it was, however, that's what it would be, it would be a reconstruction. There is really not much left of that original home, and so in terms of the integrity which has already been talked about, the dollars put forth in already muddy waters as to what is real or not real. I think it's really worth evaluating what that reconstruction would actually say about T.P. Healy's legacy in terms of what a true reconstruction is because we actually don't know. And the dollars to get there are problematic as well. So again, we ask you for approval of the demolition permit at this time. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Any further questions of the applicant from the commission?

Chair Faucher opened the public hearing.

Marlee MacLeod (2416 Colfax Ave S): I own a home at 2416 Colfax; I also rent a business location at 1017 24th St W. This is a historic resource. That's been decided, somebody did that for ya. Some of you were here for that. The job in front of you today is very specific and it's defined in the Minneapolis code of ordinances. Title 23, chapter 599, article VIII, it's already been read to you once today but I want to emphasize a couple of things. Before approving the demolition of a property determined to be a historic resource, which this is, the commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property. Or that there are no reasonable alternatives to demolition and there is some more of that paragraph that tells you what you can consider but you don't really need to. There are two words that matter in what I just read. One of them is necessary. Is this necessary as defined in here? Necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, it's been stated, no, it's not. The other word is reasonable, reasonable alternative. When the time comes for me to sell my home, I will put it on the market where a bunch of people can see it. And it will sell for a price that is based on the strengths and weaknesses of the property as it is at that moment and the market as it is at that moment. That's reasonable, it's fair. It may not be what I want, but its fair and it's reasonable. And it's what's open to all of us. And to grant an exception is a dangerous precedent because then everyone is going to want special consideration because they're not getting what they want out of their property. That's all I have to talk to you about today. Everything else that's been presented to you has already been decided and your decision lies in just that paragraph and in those two words. Thank you.

Janne Flisrand (2112 Dupont Ave S): I really like the word reasonable because I too am trying to understand what a reasonable option is for this property. It is not reasonable to assume that somebody will own a property in perpetuity and be able to maintain it in that same use and perpetuity. Last year when the Heritage Preservation Commission took the vote on considering this a historic resource it was to explore reasonable options that would allow for preservation of the property. There's been a lot of work done in the last year and a half to

find economically viable and reasonable options to preserve that property and nobody has come forward despite many requests. At this point, I cannot understand what a reasonable opportunity would be or who might come forward and help with that. So I'm asking that you support the demolition permit today. Thank you.

Anders Christensen (4347 Garfield Ave S): I want to talk about the Orth house in two different contexts. The first is historical. The Orth house was built by T.P. Healy in 1893. The two significant events of that year were the Chicago World's Fair and the panic of 1893. The previous year, 1892, Healy built 13 large Queen Anne and seven barns for good measure. It was the height of the boom. In 1890 the population of America was 67 million people. The attendance at the Chicago World's Fair was 27 million. The fair and its centerpiece, the White City, was a big deal. Healy's son-in-law Reah Smith, married to his oldest daughter Lena, was the clerk to the World's Fair managers in Minneapolis. It is hard to believe that Healy didn't take the train ride to Chicago. The fair didn't start or invent the Neoclassical or Colonial Revivals, it popularized them. Faced with a financial crisis and the change in public taste, caused by the White City, and the state buildings at the Chicago World's Fair, Healy built only four houses and three barns in 1893, four houses in four different neighborhoods; Central, Whittier, Lowry Hill East and Lowry Hill. The first 3340 Second Ave S just south of the Healy Historic District. We don't know what this one looked like; it was wrecked for 35W in 1959. Second, 2320 Colfax Ave S, the Orth house, this house would serve as his prototype for a number of houses that follow. Hip roof, dormers, full front porch, often an entrance off the side, Neoclassical details. He uses this form for nearly a decade. The Orth house is his fundamental prototype for his post World's Fair houses. The prominent position of the Orth house, on a well-traveled corner helped Healy establish a new identity to put his Queen Anne days behind him. Third, 2602 Garfield Ave S, in Whittier, and another house on a corner lot, significant features of this house are copied in 2424 Colfax and 2301 Aldrich. This one was wrecked for an apartment building in 1972. Fourth, 821 Douglas, his first house on Lowry Hill, was wrecked in 1891 for this apartment building (photo shown). Four houses, four different neighborhoods, the Orth house 2320 Colfax Ave S is the only one still standing. The second context is spacial and instructive about adaptation and sustainability. There are six Healy buildings on 24th Street from Girard to First Avenue. First, 2400 Girard Ave S built in 1897 is a three unit condominium. One unit is currently for sale for \$199,000. Zillow values the other two units at \$743,000 and \$330,000. The three units total \$1,000,000. Second, 2320 Colfax Ave S built in 1893 used as a sixteen unit rooming house. It has been a cash cow for half a century, offering affordable housing. Its value benefits from the investment that the surrounding owners have made to their properties. 2323 Bryant Ave S built in 1894, a single family home valued by Zillow at \$526,000. The current owner has painstakingly restored the exterior. Fourth, 2401 Bryant Ave S built in 1895. It is a three unit rental. It was the first house built on the 2400 block of Bryant. The exterior was painted last year. Zillow does not value it. Fifth, 811 W 24th St, built as a barn in 1899 by Healy, converted to a house in 1908, an early example of adaptive reuse and sustainability, again, no Zillow valuation. Sixth, 2412 1st Ave S, built in 1891; this house has been lived in communally for over 30 years, density 1970s style. Zillow values this house at \$407,000. These properties illustrate the variety of ways an old building can be adapted to new use, preserving the past, increasing urban density and achieving these goals in a sustainable way. Much has been made of the fact that Michael Crow has not been able to sell 2320 Colfax Ave

S. His agent Mr. Dunn listed the Orth house on a commercial real estate site, LoopNet to sell it as a rooming house. The site currently states this building is off the market. The Orth house has never been offered for sale on the Multiple Listing Service, the MLS. How do you know a property won't sell if it isn't now or never has been listed on what is widely acknowledged to be the market. Further, when this issue was before the City Council Zoning and Planning committee last year, then tenth ward Councilmember Tuthill, asked Mr. Dunn directly, did you list this house on the MLS; Mr. Dunn's answer was yes. The truth is no. It is hard to sell a house when you don't put it on the market. It is not accurate to say no one is interested in buying the Orth house until it has been fully exposed to the market. I ask you to reaffirm your decision of a year ago, that the Orth house is a historic resource and that you deny this application for demolition. I thank you all for your time, for your attention and for your service. Thank you. One other thing is, I have a new list of Healy buildings that now totals over 200, although, most of the additions to it are demolished and most of the new additions to it are in fact barns. He built a lot of barns. Thank you.

Bob Roscoe (1401 E River Parkway): I served as a commissioner for 21 years, as chair two different times. During a lot of those meetings I heard this building just can't make it. It's lost its integrity; no one wants to buy it. It's going to cost too much; the numbers just don't work out. I'm glad that those times are still around to hear them. I have 42 years' experience in working with older houses, other buildings, houses on Milwaukee Avenue. Some of those didn't have porches when we started. The Healy block, some of those houses didn't have porches when we started. Art Deck (?) and Karen Gjerstad and I are working on or have worked on a Saint Paul site where the amount of deterioration has been very advanced. The Saint Paul Heritage Preservation Commission had no problem in looking at these buildings and saying that how we did the drawings would return it to its architectural and historic integrity. I was really gratified with John Smoley's presentation, that there's two Healy houses right nearby. And I think if anything you need to reinforce what's there. It's having those two houses, its having that consistency. The Healy block also had rooming houses. It's kind of ironic that the same issue is coming up; the same issue that seemed to threaten them at the time is still here. Some things haven't changed. I think the argument has been made that 2320, we have enough Healy houses; it wouldn't hurt to let this one go. Well, our friends in Saint Paul certainly don't see it that way with Cass Gilbert houses. I drove by one today; every time I do I admire it. Cass Gilbert is very important to Saint Paul. I think in many respects, what T.P. Healy had to offer Minneapolis really has a very similar importance. And I think it's important to keep all of them. The statement was made earlier that a building is what it is. It's not what it could be. That really flies in the face of many of the projects that I've done, where there haven't been porches. There hasn't been the integrity there. But, we knew that there were ghost traces to go from. We knew how to restore parts of the interior with new materials when it came to it. Restore parts of the exterior with new material. So I think that argument isn't really what historic preservation should really be all about. Historic preservation main victories have been, when you've taken properties like that, that have lost so much and you bring them back. Bringing them back is what preservation does. The Crown Roller Mill is a good example. When that caught fire, remember some of us on HPC, we were in the council members office, there was still smoke outside, and convincing the councilmembers, don't tear that down. We have to save that building. That building is really important. I think you're faced with the same thing today. Thank you.

Brian Finstad (2951 Lyndale Ave N): I had a whole sheet of things I was going to say, I'm actually going to condense it down and ad lib because I realize some really important information that I didn't realize until I got here. I keep hearing over and over that in the last year that nobody's come forth that there is no plan. I was involved a year ago, actually before there were any hearings, I contact John Smoley and Aaron Hanauer and said we have a party that is interested in moving the house as a last ditch effort, as if there's nothing else that can be done to save this house. And we spent a lot of time on that. We identified a lot in the Washburn Fair Oaks District, we met with Marion Bain (?), we had the approval of that neighborhood, we had the house mover lined up, and we had the developer. We met with Mr. Crow, we toured the house, we had everything down to know every tree branch on the route and we knew the weight of the house. The reason that didn't go forward, the cost of moving a house is really significant and we really needed some contribution towards the move. There was a period of time where we were speaking with Mr. Crow and he had given us about a week. He said that at the end of that week, he was going to be back under contract with the Lander Group again. And things couldn't be pulled together that quickly and there was really no good will effort for any contribution from the developer. And I'm a little just confused where communication with that went. I really feel like for this project to have been stalled this long, maybe a contribution to the move would have gotten things flowing, but it didn't. I've really been under the impression the last year that the ball is really in their park, he's back under contract with Lander and they've made the decision to push their agenda through. Now I feel like we're trying to be convinced that the only viable option is just coincidentally the option that is probably the most profitable for the developer. Know they're not in this for a little bit of money, they're in this for a lot of money. So, the move would be one option and the other option is adaptive reuse. This is a development (photo shown) that happened over in Elliot Park where they took an existing historic building and did high density development with it. And all the numbers that I think were ran were just looking at the house itself. This is a whole site assembly. There is space there to do something with the house and something with the site. And the preservationists just aren't being purist preservationist that we just don't want anything torn down. Nobody is really questioning the demolition of that second house at all. So, I really feel like nobody is going to seriously consider other alternatives such as adaptive reuse or moving the house until the most profitable for the developer reaches a dead end, because it's not in their interest. Our concern is not their interest; our concern is the cultural resources of the city. This is a very valuable site, this is a desirable neighborhood, this is a neighborhood of values. I think there are lots of options, but I don't think we're even going to begin to look at them until the self-interest of maximum profit has reached a dead end. It already has with the then council person, it didn't pass through the neighborhood, it didn't pass through this commission, it didn't pass through Zoning and Planning, now we're back here. I think there's got to be a point in time where it hits a dead end so we can look at other things. I don't think those other things are going to be realistically considered until we do.

Scott Shaffer (803 Douglas Ave): I want to urge you to allow the demolition of this building. I walk by it frequently and something that Dr. Smoley said that struck me was the ability to communicate historical significance. You've seen beautiful pictures of buildings like 2320 Bryant Ave S and 2424 Colfax Ave S, which are both less than a block away. When I see those buildings it really hits home, I don't have the formal training in architecture

and public history that Dr. Smoley does or the people who conducted the 2008 survey of Lowry Hill East and ruled out 2320 Colfax as being part of a potential historic district. But, I feel it, and I don't feel that with 2320 Colfax. Especially, the change that sticks out to me the most is the enclosure of the porch because the blocks off the home from interacting with the street life. And that happened more than 40 years before Mike Crow owned the property. I think that legally mandated preservation is an extreme solution and I think that legally mandated renovation and rehabilitation is even more so. I urge you to allow the demolition so we can get new properties that will serve the community better. Thank you.

Ceridwen Christensen (3232 Pleasant Ave S): Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I want to talk today about environmental preservation. Which seems like a tangent but it really isn't. Historical preservation is environmental preservation. Ironically using the rhetoric of green living, the Lander development seeks to destroy the Orth house and replace it. And this is the least environmentally responsible option available. Article after article about conservation reiterates the point that there is no such thing as green building. As Jerri Holan, a Fulbright scholar, and member of the AIA (American Institute of Architects) points out, the facts are in, no matter how much green technology is employed any new building represents a new impact on the environment. It makes no sense to recycle newspapers, bottles and cans while we're throwing away entire buildings and neighborhoods. It is fiscally irresponsible and entirely unsustainable. The simple fact is we cannot build our way into sustainability. We must conserve our way out. We have to make better and wiser use of what we've already built. The bottom line is the greenest building is the one that already exist, razing historical buildings results in a triple hit on scarce resources. First, we are throwing away thousands of dollars of embodied energy. Using data from the advisory Council on Historic Preservation we can calculate that the Orth house at 6,000 square feet embodies roughly 9.6 billion BTU's of energy or 77 thousand gallons of gasoline. If that building is torn down, all of that embodied energy is wasted, what's more, the demolition process takes more energy. Second, we are replacing it with materials vastly more consumptive of energy. What is the Orth house built from; brick, plaster, concrete and timber. These are the least energy consumption of materials. A major component of new buildings; by contrast, are plastic, steel, vinyl and aluminum, the most energy consumptive. Third, construction of the new building would use even more energy and more natural resources, releasing more pollutants and CO2 into the environment. Recent research indicates that even 40 percent of the materials are recycled; it takes approximately 65 years for a new, efficient building to recover the energy lost in demolishing an existing building. New buildings aren't designed to last anywhere near as long as 65 years. Even if they are green rated, which this proposed development is not. Bike racks, recycling bins in common areas, and access to the bus line, do not a green building make. From the Lander website, the building concepts promotes green living, close to and providing a variety of transportation options, services, recreation and green space. The Orth house is obviously in this exact same location with the exact same access to green living. It is already a high density building. Additionally, the Orth house is low income housing. The proposed structure is not affordable housing unless the developer will sign a contract with the city for fixed rent range, something that so far has not been indicated. The Lander project, will squander irreplaceable resources, replacing a historic and therefore karma negative building with an environmentally unsustainable building of inferior material. The Orth house has stood proudly on the corner of 24th and Colfax for 120 years

and with a little help it could stand for another 120. To reduce construction expenses and maximize profits, the new building will be constructed to have a functional life of 20 to 30 years. This is the industry standard. Then it will go into the landfill and nobody will be appealing to the Heritage Preservation Commission to save it. Thank you very much.

Ethan Cherin (908 W 26th St): First I just want to thank you for the work that you do. I don't know that anybody here would deny that historic preservation is important. That we need to take these decisions very seriously. Having read through all the associated materials, I have to say I'm convinced by the staff report and I think not following the staff recommendation for demolition would require a pretty important finding on the part of the commission. In a situation like this, it seems one is always weighing the historic significance of the property against alternative uses and other elements in the neighborhood. And in this case, I think the thing that I'm most impressed by as a reason, is simply the unfairness to the owner of the property. If this were a property that actually had willing buyers that had come forward, as much as this property has been...has gotten publicity, as much we've been talking about this for the past year. There doesn't seem to be an economically viable way to reuse the property. And so, burdening the owner with the inability to sell seems patently unfair. And so, if this were a property with a little bit more historic value, that might be worthwhile. But I think given the staff report, I would absolutely urge demolition of this project.

Karen Gjerstad (4733 Isabel Ave): I am also an architect who does a lot of preservation work. I wasn't planning to speak. Most of what I have has been addressed. What I wanted to address is; I heard several times about the interior isn't intact and the porch has been added on. And that doesn't fly with me because the porch can be unenclosed and the houses down the street that look beautiful have probably had some work done. The interior doesn't really contribute to the fabric of the neighborhood. We have done many buildings where all that's really left is the exterior and the interior is new and they come out wonderful. So I'll just reiterate that the greenest building is the existing building.

Aaron Parker (4511 Lyndale Ave S): I'm an architect and an urban designer in Minneapolis. I reviewed the files for the property and visited the property, didn't get inside. I've done so because I am in favor of protecting properties of historic merit. And have been an architect on renovations of numerous buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places. My heart is there. In reading through, well, I guess first I want to make a distinction between historic preservation and historic restoration. People are talking about this as a preservation project, but my understanding from reading the reports is that there are some original parts on the interior, on the ground floor. And that there are some parts that retained their character on the exterior as well. But by and large, this would need to be a restoration project. I understand that there are no extent drawings for the building that would assist, although there are some photographs. Landscape Research, with whom I've worked, is a very reputable firm and Mead and Hunt was hired, was funded by SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), to look at all of the Wedge in 2005 and again by the City of Minneapolis in 2008. They did not find that this building rose to the level of designation. Furthermore they also identified a residential district, the Lowry Hill East potential residential district proposed, which actually comes both east of this property and south of this

property right up to the corner on either side. Inexplicably, they did not designate this building as part of that district, so while you could have actually had a full intersection. They did not feel that it even rose to the level of being part of a district. Given that, I reluctantly come down on the side of saying this application for demolition should be approved.

Brian Nelson (2400 Bryant Ave S): We live in a home that is a single family home. One of the things my neighbors, several of whom are here, were terrified about 30 years ago when we bought it, was what were we going to do with it. Were we going to keep it a single family home or not? I think they are pretty convinced we are; we've been there 32 years. We bought a couple of other homes. One right next to us, one across the way and we converted those from four unit and two unit buildings. Tore a terrible garage addition off of one of them and turned them into single family homes. One of them sold in three days last fall for \$515,000. That's cool. Of course, we bought that house before we renovated it for \$60,000. We put \$80,000 into it and sold it to a friend that I helped finance a restaurant of his, which is why I made him buy the house and he bought it for \$140,000, which is what we had in it. You couldn't do that at 2320 anymore. If you're paying \$400,000 for a nice house, it's a great neighborhood by the way. I read in the paper today that other people might want to move into the neighborhood because it's got a lot of nice restaurants and it's a great place to live. I wish they would have said that 32 years ago. All we really had, which was really good, was really good neighbors. So sometimes we get into issues about what we should do or what we should not do in a neighborhood. I appreciate that. I made an offer last time, I heard somebody say they were trying to figure out a way to move it possibly. I offered to pay a thousand bucks; some of you might have been here. I said I'd pay a thousand bucks that would at least cut the first wires to help move it. That's probably all it would do, it wouldn't do much. But, I was trying to get somebody to call me. Somebody to email me, somebody to do something, we maybe could have put something together. I don't see it happening. It's not a house that generates the level of enthusiasm for the amount of money that you'd have to put into it. That's the problem. I wish you could move it. If you don't move it, I'm afraid that at the end of the day and you try to force this guy to do something with it. What kind of liability does the city end with in a situation like this? Where you tell I guy he can't do something. Do you have some potential liability there? I don't know; I don't know how that works. I don't what the condemnation laws are in Minnesota on that kind of an issue. It terrifies me a little bit as a tax payer. We were delighted when we moved in, and I think our taxes were, I don't know, \$1500 or \$1200 a year. Last year they were \$20,000. I think they went down this year to \$18,000. The point is the people who are here talking about historic preservation and so on are genuine people. Genuine people who care about the neighborhood and care about it in a lot of ways. And there are those of us who go back and forth, and I'm one of those. Where I say should we save this building or not save that building. I think sometimes it's a question of where do we put our resources. I'm at an age in my life, at a time in my life where a thousand bucks is a fair amount of money now. I'll still throw a thousand bucks if you want to move it. Thank you.

Ezra Gray (2109 Bryant Ave S): I just want to touch on a point that I haven't really seen brought up and that's that this house when it was built basically anchored the southwest corner of a division that was built up by Edward G Walton. Starting in 1892 it was called Sunnyside. That's the part of Lowry Hill East that's north of 24th street, between Franklin

and 24th, and Hennepin and Lyndale. When this neighborhood was put in, it was considered to be just about the most sought after street car suburb, that's the term they used. I've gone through and pulled a permit for every house between Franklin and 24th. The average cost of these houses was \$5200 when the average cost for a house in Minneapolis at that time was somewhere around \$1600. After World War II people came in and started tearing these houses down. Anyone with the where withal, it was no problem for them to just tear down. There was one apartment block on Aldrich I know where they tore down four houses and built these monstrous eccentric apartment blocks. Between 1945 and 1974, over forty of the just over 120 houses that had been built in that neighborhood by 1974 were gone. At that time from what I gathered, it stopped largely because of a strong group of personalities in the Lowry Hill East neighborhood association that made a stand. They made it much more difficult for that to continue to happen. Since 1974, in north of 24th Street, they have not lost a single house to high residential development since that time. There's only one house that's been lost and it was for an office building, which brings me to my point, Lowry Hill East; the house I bought, in 1979 was an eight unit rooming house. Really shabby, I finally, after some searching located the fellow who bought it in 1979 and made the first progress towards moving it away from a rooming house, he turned it into a duplex. And I've seen pictures of the house during that era. It was shabby, it was a seedy house. And since 2011 when we moved in, we've spent an immense amount of work to it. We completely restored pretty much the first floor. We reinstalled the fireplace that was in there originally. The point being that if we can do this, other people can do that. As long as that house is still standing at 2320 Colfax, there's a chance that somebody could be inspired by what we've done and what quite a few other people in this neighborhood have done. Once it's gone that's it. Sunnyside can't afford to lose another house like that. We need them all; we need all the ones that are left.

Judy Harris (4728 Aldrich Ave N): I am the property manager of four homes within a block of 2320 and Mr. Handevitd the owner of those properties, wished me to express his concern. If you're designating this house, and I'd also like to ask have any of you toured this house. Let's make it a rhetorical question. To go through it and to understand better then, just listening and I understand the passion of these people, I love the old homes, that's why I'm still connected with Uptown. So, I understand that, but I think it's been tweaked and twisted to create a situation that is taking a man whose owned a property for a lot of years, whose paid a great deal of property taxes. And now you're declaring his property historical, what does that do to the other T. P. Healy homes in the neighborhood. For the owner of those properties, I'm speaking for the owner of the ones I manage, how does he sale those if they are going to be declared historical. After he's already purchased them and owned them, one of them for over 45 years. And one of them is a rooming house and the picture was shown. So, his concerns are, what are you doing to the rest of them for future ability to...for the people who have contributed to the city with tax money, with housing for other people, a lot of people. What are you doing for them in the future; too I understand preserving something that has some integrity to it. I've been in that building a lot and it doesn't have very much and you've heard experts, a lot of passion and experts. I would hope that you would vote to allow this project to go forward and demolish the property.

Mandy Wong (2815 Harriet Ave S): I live two doors down; I've owned the house for seventeen years. When I moved in Mike Crow owned a rooming house on the other side of

the garbage house. I have to say, he's been nothing but an excellent neighbor and an excellent small business person. Speaking for myself; it's no longer a rooming house, his son owns it now, but we've never had any problems, the place looked great. I always felt like he was providing this service to people who would be otherwise be homeless or maybe stuck in a system that they were really restricted, their liberties were really restricted in. I feel like he's being paid back with a lot of name calling, and it makes me really sad because Mike is a great guy. My house is 1800 square feet and I bought it for \$70,000. And there's about \$200,000 that have gone into it and I would say if I had another \$150,000 it might be up to date. I like old houses and I was hoping somebody would come forward to buy this. But nobody has and this name calling can't continue. He's being judged very harshly on social media and he's a great guy. He's a great guy. Thank you.

David Piehl (3127 2nd Ave S): I live in a historic district of Healy's and I heard mention tonight of 3115 preceding in the same Free Classic style, the Orth house that we're talking about tonight. The difference between the two is that 3115 was never duplicated. It was the first attempt probably; Healy didn't get it right on that one. He got it right on the Orth house and duplicated it numerous times. So it's significant in that respect. I read in the Star Tribune today that John Smoley said that because the windows among other things weren't original in the Orth house that it wasn't as significant. But not even two months ago he was here, giving staff approval to replacing windows in a house on the Healy Block where they could have been restored. I think you might remember that. So, I'm wondering why there's a double standard there. But that aside, that was 3112 2nd, that aside, we've heard talk about a potential historic district that would be on basically two sides of the Orth house, and a non-contributing Healy within the Healy District. Well, it got national designation within the Healy District, even though it's considered non-contributing because of alterations, because it's there among the collection. The Orth house is going to be right there among the collection of historic homes that would be a potential historic district. And is it right to box in a potential historic district with six stories, five stories, four stories, whatever it is going to be on each side and just sort of have the historic district in the middle. That would be just kind of weird and probably would impugn the ability of that district to survive. And I know a little of something about that too. What I will say is, let me say something about enclosed porches. A lot of the porches on the Healy block were previously enclosed, mine as well, it takes a day to undo that. That's not a big deal. But I also heard numerous times in John Smoley's report that there are better examples. There are better examples that can be preserved. There are about 120 Healy homes left. That argument could be used to demolish 119 of them. There's always the best example out there somewhere, if you use that argument, there's no end to it. So, there was earlier talk of a myth. I think somebody was referring to the myth of Vikings and their horns, or something like that. But the real myth is that, pertaining to this subject, the myths are that it was ever really on the market. It was never on the MLS. That's how you sell a house if you really want to sell it. The myth is that it's not significant. The myth is that the new project is somehow green, when we're pushing 200 tons of material into a landfill, if this gets demolished. The myth is that this house is not already dense. It's dense. And the biggest myth is that it needs to be demolished. Thank you.

Nick Majrino (215 Oak Grove): I just have a quick comment to make about the application. Right now this is the Heritage Preservation Committee and you guys considered an

application about this property, as you said, about a year ago. But I think it's pretty clear that for the most part the opposition to this project is based on the development that will probably come in the event that you do approve the application to demolish the building. Having followed a lot of development in Minneapolis, there would be probably the same amount of opposition to this project if it were a vacant lot, if it were a less potentially historic house, if it were a gas station from the 1970s. You'd have basically the exact same amount of opposition to the project. I think it's pretty clear based on Dr. Smoley's report that it isn't a historic resource. So, I would urge you to approve the demolition.

Gregg Rogers (2321 Colfax Ave S): I live right across the street. I just moved in a couple months ago and so this is all fairly new to me. I saw the notice and thought I'd come down and take a look and listen. I didn't expect to talk and didn't have any of the technical prepared as some of the other folks had and I certainly understand that the folks that live in the neighborhood have a very strong argument as they should. And the folks that want to develop have a very strong argument. The interesting piece that I've heard relative to the Orth house and some of the names of the builders and all that, that these folks have a footprint that's sort of all over the city and yet we don't consider the footprint that's made to the Wedge. In other words, wants the integrity of the Wedge? And how is that affected by some of these new developments? And there's already a lot of high density housing on that block, in the street, in that area that's already there. So one more piece, I'm not sure, will add any more value except for the destruction at least in my opinion of the existing Wedge. What made that great is sort of eroding slowly and what makes it a great place now will slowly erode if we do something like that. We're building another high block structure that again erodes away at the integrity of the Wedge. To my mind as a layman looking at it I can think of all of the times when I first came to Minneapolis, when you're sort of in an area and you drive around and you think wow, this is a great little area. Wow, look at that thing, there's a 70s style, or 60s style or 50s style sort of hive that's been thrown up and it's just like wow, wish they would have considered a little more before they put that there. SO I think in the end, we all know esthetically it may not bring a lot of value but at the same time I think that the integrity of the Wedge itself should be considered as an entity in and of itself and the comparison of the greater Minneapolis, I think its relevant but at the same time the Wedge was a fairly desired area and it is slowly eroding and I think it needs to stop before it erodes away and slowly finds itself into a block of apartment buildings that really bring no real value and now we see a Cabrini Green like thing 20 or 30 years from now. That's just my comment but certainly that's what it appears it would be come ultimately in my mind. I would urge you not to approve any kind of demolition.

Josh Dibley (31 W 35th St): I believe there is a lot of value to historic preservation, but it also has its cost. When considering this particular house, I think you should really keep in mind the multiple studies that have been done that kind of speak to how it's not just the inside deteriorating, it's not just the outside, it's both. And when considering to go forward with demolition or not, you should keep in mind the opportunity cost of what else can go in there. It is surrounded by high density housing, but that housing has a value in adding property tax payers, property tax base and adding more people to use the nearby bus line and to make sure we have a welcoming neighborhood, welcoming new citizens who want to live in this area. So I urge you to take the studies into account and ask whether preserving this

house really has a lot of value or whether it's simply kind of diminishing what the historic designation means. If we use historic designation on houses that aren't really deserving, what does that say for the process and for the designation overall? Thanks.

Bryan Altman (2619 Fremont Ave S): I have no vested interest in the demolition of the development of this project. I'm just a neighbor. I am in favor of maintaining the character and the historical nature of the neighborhood, however, since I've been sitting here and waffling on which side of the argument I'd like to make my recommendation on. What I've heard is that, there hasn't been a reasonable offer on this property. Only one person come forth and said that they had a plan or were in discussions with the owner of the property to make a deal besides the current developer. That person recommended moving the property, subsequent to him, we heard from an environmental speaker, speaking on the environmental side saying that this is the least environmental option. Actually the least environmental option is the option to move this house and develop the property. Finally, we're not building Cabrini Green. This is not a developer building thousands of units on one block. It's a developer looking to take a home that's in disrepair and put high density living there where there's high density living. In a property is new, works and this is a person, I don't know who they are, but it's a person who is willing to maintain this property, who's able to maintain this property for its tenants. My understanding of the current owner's position he is unable to maintain this property at a level that tenants would expect from their landlords in the city of Minneapolis. So I urge you to vote in favor of demolishing the property. I think it's reasonable to expect that this is the only way for this person to make a fair deal on the property. And it's unreasonable to expect that they're going to get a fair price for the home as it exist today as a boarding home. Nobody's come forth and said they've made an offer on this house as a boarding property. There's been no indication that that's been done, unless I'm mistaken. I think it's unreasonable to assume that because the house hasn't been listed on the MLS that it hasn't been marketed properly. I know about this house because it's appeared in every paper I can read locally and nationally. I've heard about it from at least ten to twenty of my neighbors. And I probably hear about it once a week or once every couple of weeks from people who are invested in this project on either side. I shouldn't say invested, but are for or against this property. Everybody knows that this property exist, everybody knows that it's open to be toured, everybody knows that the owner's available if you have an offer or plan to speak with him about. If there were legitimate offers that would have been made, those people would be here speaking to those offers today, they're not. Give this owner a break, let him demolish the property and sell it to the developer. Thank you.

Connie Lindor (403 W 25th St): My husband and I own several rental properties in the neighborhood. We both went to architecture school. We try to preserve them. We had a major fire at one of them recently; we are painstakingly trying to renovate it, just a half a block away. I had no idea this property was for sale. It wasn't listed on the MLS, we read the New York Times and the Star Tribune, so we really didn't know. So I don't think it's been fairly listed or marketed.

Chair Faucher closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Vork: Thank you Madam Chair. In response to recent conversations about starting discussion with a motion, I'd like to offer a motion. I might need a little bit of help with the wording though so bear with me, this will be my first motion as a commissioner here. I'd like to offer a motion to deny the application for demolition of a historic resource and direct staff to place the property under interim protection pending a designation study. If I'm lucky enough to get a second, I'd like to offer some commentary too.

Commissioner R. Mack: Second.

Commissioner Vork: I have two comments. That first commenter stole my thunder because I really wanted to be the one to remind us all of what we're here to do and that is, according to the ordinance, determine that this demolition is necessary and that no reasonable alternatives exist. But she did a good job of that. The second thing is I just want to point out that this property has not been marketed for sale. As we sat here, and beforehand, but again as we sat here, just to make sure I wasn't wrong. I checked the MLS and MNCAR, which is the Minnesota Commercial Association of Real Estate Agents. This property is not listed; it has not been listed in the past when I've searched. Perhaps because those sites involve a fee to become a member, I'm not sure. But there is another site that is fairly popular called LoopNet which is free to list a commercial property on. This property is not listed on that one either. In fact, and I could be searching wrong, but I searched three times on Terra Firma Commercial's site and I don't see this property listed there. So I feel that those that are saying this property has been marketed and no one is coming forward may be disingenuous.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: This one has about a million and five different issues. Some of which to me are very, very big sort of philosophical issues, others rather more nitty gritty. We keep coming back to the fires in the interior. If we're not designating the interior, who cares? To be blunt, it doesn't matter. With regards to the exterior, the question is can it be restored? I've lived long enough, and I've been in enough old Healy houses before they were restored. I mean we're seeing all these lovely pictures, and I can absolutely tell you those houses did not look that way. They have been restored lovingly, painstakingly over a period of time. I don't really see why the same could not happen to this house. I mention before, I'm a social historian not an architect, so when I feel like people are getting short trift, I get kind of cranky. And Mr. Kenyon; we keep referring to it as the Orth house and I know why because it was built for him. On the other hand, Mr. Kenyon was a very significant person in the city of Minneapolis and he was the quintessential American success story. You know Horatio Alger has nothing on this guy. He had built a very successful business, he was a wizard at marketing, and he was not a quack. That's the kind of thing that makes me nuts, but that's what I do. The other issue is the thing about what you see; it's what you see that matters. My favorite book is a book called *In the Memory House* by Howard Mansfield and he makes a very interesting point which is probably hundreds of thousands of people pay to look at Old Ironsides. They go out east and they want to see this fabulous ship. Well the fact of the matter is, that's not Old Ironsides, that's probably a restoration. There is probably no more than five percent of that that's original. But we still say its Old Ironsides. And I think that's really a key way to think about this is, the distinctions between preservation and restoration are kind of interesting. Nonetheless, is it less real because it has been restored, maintained over time? I would argue, that yes its very real, if the structure is there and it can

be brought back to look the way it did. That it has some value. And the argument and you've all heard me complain about this. The argument that we have a lot of them therefore we don't need to save one of them is just simply not one that I buy. There are 1100 Stradivarius violins in the world; it doesn't mean we go around busting up the ones that we don't think are necessary. I can't think of anything, any piece of art where we are quite as profligate as we are with our architecture. We don't destroy paintings that way; I can't think anything that we destroy kind of gleefully, willfully as we do with buildings. And I think it's something that we need to give very serious thought to. That's why I would vote in favor of Commissioner Vork's motion.

Chair Faucher: A couple of points. I think the Orth house, it wasn't built for Orth. It was built on speculation, but he was the first resident. Second, I know that people kind of brindle at the idea of you have to evaluate it at face value, and especially as an architect because I see potential. However I did find this out, as far as the Secretary of the Interior is concerned, you do have to evaluate it at what is there as far as what is there and not just the potential. So I'm torn on this one. And I usually don't pontificate too much but I just feel that the integrity question is a big one on this one.

Commissioner L. Mack: I'd like to speak against the motion, mostly on the integrity issue. And I think the most telling presentation on that actually was Mr. Christensen's because seeing the other Healy houses that are nearby and are in excellent shape, what beautiful places they are. You just say, this is what should be landmarked if we are going to landmark something. The idea that 2320 will become a landmark structure in Minneapolis to me is actually a very sad day, because it is not a prime example of anybody's work. It is not likely that it is going to be restored. There may be reasonable alternatives, the owner is unwilling or unable to put the amount of money in this building that it would take to restore it, not just conserve it. There are, as we've seen, numerous structures by Healy around the city. It's wonderful that so many exist. It does not mean that every one of them has to be preserved. And it does not mean that the one that is really the least example of his work should be. That is my reasoning.

Commissioner R. Mack: This is somewhat similar to some of the other comments. I think we need to remember that we have to operate within the charge of our ordinance. We cannot or should not consider, the greening or un-greening as a result of this project. We should not consider the densification or de-densification of the neighborhood as a result of this potential project. But we also need to not be swayed by thought that this is an anti-development movement to try to preserve the house. That's not relevant to what we are here to discuss. What we are here to discuss is the significance of this property and whether it meets our criteria for designation. You can look at the potential, but that again is not unfortunately, very unfortunately, within the purview of our ordinance.

Commissioner Hartnett: When I look at these I ask myself, what are we trying to save and is there a viable option for it? And I think Amy Lucas did a terrific job of explaining what it is, what it was, the Free-Classic style and there are a number of potentially at their current state, better examples of that. So it's not like it's a property that if we lose it, we would lose that style, we'd lose that historic piece. And I think that it's a really valid argument that

there's a \$500,000 shortfall to bring it back to single family. So I feel like the owners of the building have come forward with a really compelling argument, I think it's a valid argument. And I think it makes a lot of sense. But then there were some chinks in the armor a little bit. This question of MLS listing is probably a big one. Unfortunately I don't know firsthand a lot of these things, so I have to make a judgment based on what I believe. I lived in a house, that was a rooming house and was turned into a single family home again and it wasn't significance historically but it was a great house. And someone took a chance on it and it continues to be a great house. So I wonder about that, if there isn't a future for this house as a single family. It certainly doesn't hurt to bring Bob Roscoe in front of us, 22 years a commissioner and say, you know we gotta fight for this. I appreciate you being here Bob and making your pitch. That means something to me. The question is there a reasonable option? And the gentleman talked about the desire and the work that was put in to potentially taking this house and moving it, and that seems like an option to me. So I ask myself, why do we have to lose this house. Why should we lose a house if we don't have to? I think Commissioner Linda Mack makes a good point, that there are a lot more houses out there but it still potentially has value. And I agree, I don't know what's behind the walls, and if you look at the walls right now there's not a lot there I would imagine. And the front porch is probably pretty ugly. But we don't know what's in there, and you're right, I've been told previously that I go beyond our charter too much. Ok, I'm guilty of that. But it seems to me, that the developer and the homeowner, the value of this is the land. And to be able to put up your development, it sounds like a really potentially valuable development for this area. And I really support that development and the house stands in the way of it. I would argue and support the motion that's been put forth to try to give time so that the option of moving the house and putting it somewhere else and letting someone else do something with it, is explored because it sounds like there's someone has stepped up and made that argument.

Commissioner Lackovic: First of all this has been an amazing turn out tonight. It wasn't anything I was expecting. So, great points, great argument on both sides of the fence on this one. I'm really encouraged to see those. Hopefully, you're seeing that on our side too, that there's always room for discussion. For me this one was tough on a number of levels. I'm going to keep it to what's in our charter and our responsibilities. It really came down to integrity and how we define integrity, is for me the crux of this argument. There's no doubt that this house in my opinion is worthy of its designation. It has association with one of the master builders in the city. You can't deny its pedigree for me. So it's not a question of whether or not the house meets that class, it does, but how much of it is left, is really something I struggle with a little bit. As our Chair has mentioned, it's difficult for an architect to not see potential in things. We rehabilitate buildings all the time, with far less existing information than what this house has to offer. I can think of quite a few examples, where we've brought buildings back, crawling around on our hands and knees looking for one inch, one square inch of material to give us that clue to do a faithful rehabilitation. This building, I think, there's a lot that's been lost. The bones are still there, we can't deny that. When I first opened the agenda for this and saw the address, without even looking at it, without even looking at any of the background written information. It's like oh my God, that's gotta be a Healy house. You can see it. Granted the integrity is definitely eroded over time but it's still recognizable. But is there enough there to merit it's salvation at this point; I think is really the argument. For me the interior, a lot of that interior charm is gone, so for the

individual designation I think for the Healy houses, the interior actually is a big part of it as well as the exterior. It's lost most of the exterior materials, not that any of that can't be brought back. But it's an extensive rehabilitation at that point. So for me, I actually tipped towards the opposite end of the spectrum for a change. Strangely, I don't think this one is exemplary and I think it's unfortunately at a point where looking at it individually, I would support demolition. However, I think it's something we all have to be aware of, it still is a character defining element in that neighborhood whether it met the Mead and Hunt surveys' qualification at that time. It still provides really valid edge and a defining structure for that neighborhood boundary. It fits, it's appropriate, and I still would hate to see it lost.

R. Mack: I think that to my way of thinking, when you're considering integrity. Its, is the essential form there so that the building is still recognizable. Yes, it might take some work to restore it to pristine integrity. But, is the essential form still there, the guts, the shape, the window locations in general and so forth. Forty years ago, if you had walked down Milwaukee Ave you would have said not one of these houses has sufficient integrity to be designated. Yet it was designated, that street was restored, and it's been an award winning gem of Minneapolis ever since those houses were done, 35 or so years ago. So I think, to my way of thinking, that house does has sufficient integrity to merit designation.

Commissioner Vork: I love this conversation about integrity; we could have it all night long. I just want to remind everyone that if we vote to approve this demolition, we will be stating that no reasonable alternative exist in our opinion.

Chair Faucher: I want to comment on the amount of time that there has been since, and I realize have some new commissioners who maybe haven't seen this project before, but there has been a year, we were aware of this and no one has nominated this particular house to be studied or to be designated, and to have a study done on this. And I kind of wondered about that at first, I was kind of surprised when I looked back at our actions from last year and realized that we didn't do that when we granted the appeal. And I kind of was wondering why didn't we do that? To me the real deciding factor last year, for me personally, was the idea that this was a pivotal moment in a transition of styles for Healy and having to do with the economic times. But finding out that there are other houses that exemplify that same style that were built prior to this house, I think kind of makes that argument not as strong with me, just kind of some food for thought. One other thing is too, whatever comes of this I would hope that we've had recent discussions about being proactive and designating landmarks as a commission and districts. And whatever our outcome tonight maybe this kind of brings us, draws our attention again to the Wedge. I know we have many potential districts that have been identified in the past, potential districts and landmarks. As we see, development pressure in this area is an issue and so maybe it is time to take a look again at some of these previous studies. I would certainly welcome if any of the commissioners wished at some point to nominate some of these potential districts, that's kind of aside from our decision here tonight.

L. Mack: I know the words say no reasonable alternative, but we've been in this position before. I unfortunately can't come up with examples, but we've looked at buildings that have some historic significance, they may have even been declared a historic resource. And we've

looked at their condition and we've assessed the reality of the situation. And the reality of the situation was it's not going to happen, that they're going to be restored or brought back. I think it's up to us to interpret those words in the sense of what's likely to happen. I don't if our Chair agrees.

Chair Faucher: I do agree actually, it does say that. It goes on to say that we shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the demolition but in determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider but not limited to the significance of the property, which I think many of us would agree it has some significance. The integrity of the property, which I think is more questionable, we have opinions on both sides. And the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, in concluding its current use, cost of renovation, and feasible alternative uses.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: That reminds me of something that we talked about at our retreat. The whole notion of reasonable gets a little icky here, because we will have different definitions of what that it is. I think we are clearly told that it's not our responsibility to ensure that someone makes the largest possible profit off a property that is not our issue. We presumably don't want somebody to lose their shirt on a property. On the other hand, someone once put it to me, you don't allow someone to tear down the American Swedish Institute and build a car wash because they can make more money doing it that way. There are some risks inherent in buying, selling, trading properties and I think some of you who deal with real estate more than I, know that. The other thing is, we probably didn't do what we should've last year. The fact is, is that sufficient reason to vote for demolition because we didn't protect a building at a time? I went back and looked at that, because frankly I was little stunned that we had not asked for a designation study at the time. I guess I assumed, wrongly, that that was built in because we determined the property was a historic resource. And it wasn't even close, the vote was eight to two as I recall. It went to Zoning and Planning and the vote was five to zero agreeing with us and I don't know what the vote was at the City Council but I'm not remembering that that was a real close one either. Whether or not we actually followed through on that and did what we should have done is one thing. But I think our feeling about the property itself was pretty clear. I think it was not very ambiguous last year, I would hate to think of that as a reason why this building rises or falls. I just don't think that that's ok. And still for me, the reasonableness really comes back to the marketing, was the property marketed in such a way that it had a chance to survive. And that's the part that I just don't see.

Commissioner Stade: I think I recall that moving it is problematic because of the weight, mass of the building. I think a mover talked in front of us last time. And said it's built very solidly but it's very heavy. So moving it didn't seem very viable to me at the last hearing. The other thing is, I don't feel bad about designating this historically, because I really feel Lowry Hill East needs to be a historic district, a potentially historic district, of course it is. I believe geographically it should be a lot larger than these districts because there are buildings like the 1852 R. P. Russell house on 26th and Bryant that should be part of that district as well, in my opinion. So I think that it's much more imperative that this should be a district than this particular building like the Dinkytown building should be a historic building.

Commissioner Vork: I agree with Commissioner Stade's comments that this should be a district. I just want to make two quick comments. I probably should have noted before that the property that's being compared and illustrated as an earlier example of Healy's beginning to transition away from strict Queen Anne Victorian, is a property that I lived in until few years ago, so I'm familiar with it. I can't remember who commented, I think it was David Piehl, who said it was not replicated. That is correct in my observation. It is a little different than the other homes on the Healy block, but it's not the same as the Orth house, and the Orth house is the one that was replicated. So I saw that as kind of a difference. My other comment is, with respect to Commissioner Linda Mack's comments, about looking at what's reasonable and kind of tempering that with reality. I understand that position, however coming right on the heels of so many comments.... [End of tape 3, side A]...a lot of us look at this property and know that it could be restored but if we need to talk about integrity based on how it looks right now, then I think we need to talk about reasonable alternatives and whether none exist based on how it's worded because those are the rules.

Chair Faucher: I think that everyone has said their piece. We have a motion on the floor to deny the demolition permit. Fatima maybe you could read back to us what we had said earlier.

Committee Clerk: To deny the application and recommend it for interim protection pending a designation study.

Absent: P. Bengtson, A. Haecker

Aye: C. Hartnett, S. Hunter Weir, G. Lackovic, R. Mack, C. Vork

Nay: L. Faucher, L. Mack, I. Stade

Motion passed